

Donna M. Leidenheimer
Name

Signature

Donna M. Laidenheimer

Signature



RECEIVED

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE RESPONSE/AMENDMENT

Case Docket No. 8415

Box Non-Fee Amendment
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith is an AMENDMENT for the patent application:

Inventor(s): KLINE, ET AL.

Confirmation No. 5337

Serial No.: 09/778,687

Group Art Unit: 3761

Date Filed: February 7, 2001

Examiner: J.A. Webb

Title: ACTIVE CHANGE AIDS FOR EXTERNAL ARTICLES

1. [X] No additional fee is known to be required.

2. [] The fee has been calculated as shown below:

OTHER THAN A

(Col. 1)			(Col. 2)	(Coi. 3)	SMALL ENTITY	
	CLAIMS					
	REMAINING		HIGHEST NO.			
	AFTER		PREVIOUSLY	PRESENT		
	AMENDMENT		PAID FOR	EXTRA*	RATE	FEE
TOTAL	* 8	MINUS	** 36	= 0	x \$18 =	\$0.00
INDEP.	* 2	MINUS	*** 2	= 0	x \$84 =	\$0.00
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEP. CLAIM					+ \$280 =	\$0.00
					TOTAL.	\$0.00

* If the entry in Col. 1 is less than the entry in Col. 2, write "0" in Col. 3.

** If the highest number of total claims previously paid for is less than 20, write "20" in this space.

*** If the highest number of independent claims previously paid for is less than 3, write "3" in this space.

The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent) is the highest number found from the equivalent box in Col. 1 of a prior amendment or the number of claims originally filed.

- 3. [] The Commissioner is hereby petitioned under 37 CFR §1.136(a) to grant any extension of time needed for timely response to the Office Action dated in the above-identified application to preserve pendency of said application. The processing fee under 37 CFR §1.17 has been determined as follows: \$ for a -month extension of time.
- 4. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of the following fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 16-2480. A duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.
 - a. [x] Any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR §1.16.
 - b. [x] Any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR §1.17.
- 5. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to make any additional copies of this sheet needed to accomplish the purposes provided for herein and to charge any fee for such copies to Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Michael P. Hayden

Attorney or Agent for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 48,433

(last revised 7/1//02)

١

Date: January 4, 2003

Customer No. 27752

Tel. No. (513) 626-5800

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

DONNA M. LEIDENHEIMER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Case 84

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

KLINE ET AL.

Serial No. 09/778,687

Filed: 7 February 2001

Confirmation No. 5337

Group Art Unit: 3761

Examiner: Jamisue A. Webb

For: ACTIVE CHANGE AIDS FOR EXTERNAL ARTICLES

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

In response to the Office Action of 5 November 2002, applicants hereby respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

Applicants' agent wishes to thank the Examiner for the examination of the above-identified Application.

Allowance of Claim 4

Applicants' agent wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of Claim 4 as amended in the previous response in accordance with the Examiner's statement of allowable subject matter in the first Office Action.

Withdrawal of Previously Indicated Allowability of Claims 19 Through 25

Applicants previously amended Claim 19 in accordance with the Examiner's statement in the first Office Action of allowable subject matter. However, in the present Office Action, the Examiner stated that "[t]he [previously] indicated allowability of claims 19-25 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s)" and that "[r]ejections based on the newly discovered reference(s) follow."

Applicants' agent respectfully avers that this withdrawal is contrary to the clear direction provided in MPEP 706.07 and in MPEP 707.07(g) against piecemeal examination and against "[s]witching...from one set of references to another by the examiner in rejecting in successive actions claims of substantially the same subject matter" (MPEP